

7632/B

L. LXVI.

19 / m

by Sir T.C. Morgan.

AN
EXPOSTULATORY LETTER

TO
DR. MOSELEY,

ON HIS
REVIEW OF THE REPORT
OF THE
LONDON COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS
ON
Vaccination.

Ωστε μήτε οργαίς μήτε χάρισι συνεχέσθαι, εν ασθενεί γαρ παν το τοιούτον.

Nunc autem multi Abderitanæ plebis pectora habent, — qui nova inventa illorum, qui veluti magno quodam numinis afflatu, ad rerum causas indagandas et cognoscendas omnia sua studia contulerunt, tanquam inutilia calumnientur.

Praefat. Zach. Sylvi in Harvæi Exercitationes Anatomicas.

BY M. T. C. M.B. F.L.S.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, AND SOLD BY J. MURRAY,
FLEET-STREET.

1808.

91899



C. Squire, Printer,
Furnival's-Inn-Court.

PREFACE.

IT is not without considerable hesitation that the following remarks are offered to the public. Whatever reputation Dr. Moseley may formerly have enjoyed, or whatever his character may now be, abstractedly considered, the manner in which he and his associates have carried on the contest with the friends and supporters of Vaccination, must make the most thoughtless pause before they commit their reputation, by descending into the arena against him. Who shall touch pitch and not be defiled? Who can answer Dr. M. without the danger of descending to abuse?

Another and more powerful suggestion likewise occurs. Are the opposers of Vaccination worth the trouble of an answer; especially when they but repeat what has already been ably and completely answered?

As far as they alone are concerned, most undoubtedly an answer is unnecessary: Vaccination stands upon so proudly a pre-eminent base throughout the whole world, that it is perfectly out of the reach of any adversaries, much more such as at present are carping at it. Small-pox inoculation is scarcely any longer practised at Paris, or in any of the great cities of the European continent. In India, the English have most cordially embraced it, and the natives bring their children thirty and more miles to render them partakers in this new blessing of Providence. In America, the Indians, as well as the subjects of the United States, have eagerly received it; and the former have paid the debt of gratitude to Dr. Jenner, by presenting him with their highest honour, the Wampum Belt.

Why then, under such circumstances, attack any of this puny host of ill-timed cavillers? The reason is indeed a cogent one, and paramount to every other consideration. Dr. Moseley does not write for his professional brethren, of whose ill opinion he is sufficiently

assured: he writes for the weak parent; the bigotted friend; for the literary lounge, and the illiterate vulgar: and he has well levelled his style to their comprehension. The boldness of his assertions will alarm, the mountebank cast of his wit will amuse such, and such only. If then his book passes current unanswered, how many lives must pay the forfeit of this fatal security! Time alone is the parent of truth: but if, in the meanwhile, Dr. Moseley is suffered to slay his thousands by gross perversions of fact and reasoning, his opponents surely will not be, in such a case, undeserving of censure.

One word more.---After the repeated mention of *I*, necessary in the epistolary style, it may seem rather singular that this publication appears in some degree anonymously. As far as the public are concerned, there are few if any facts in it resting on the author's sole authority; and beyond facts, the public have little to do with the author's name. As to Dr. Moseley, it may be answered to his enquiries on the subject, in the words of Zanga, ---“to know were little comfort.” While

the author is in obscurity, Dr. M. may indulge his vanity, by supposing the I's as little as he chooses---small as the *tauricles* floating in the vaccine fluid, in----the Doctor's own imagination.

AN
EXPOSTULATORY LETTER
TO
DR. MOSELEY,
&c.

SIR,

ECCE iterum Crispinus ! You have again appeared in print ; and, I am sorry to find, with the same intemperate and uncontroversial spirit that has done you so little credit in your former writings upon Vaccination. Although I have not the honor of your personal acquaintance, allow me to say, that I have heard your convivial talents highly commended ; which should seem to imply good nature, wit, and consequently elegance of mind and a desire to please : I have heard, likewise, that, for many years, you preserved a respectable character as a physician ; which certainly implies an acquaintance with science, superior both to the matter and manner of those of your late writings which I have had the infelicity to peruse : you belong, too, to a profession which I am always willing to

believe inclines its votaries forcibly to the love of truth and of their fellow creatures. Most willingly therefore would I give you credit for being sincere in your opinions, desirous of convincing your professional brethren, and not merely *aiming at the seduction of those whose rank in life and talents render them totally incapable of appreciating the subject of your lucubrations*. Nothing can be more afflicting to a liberal mind than to suspect others of intention to deceive; and that too on a point in which not only the welfare, but the existence of a large portion of mankind is at stake. Yet in what way can a sober looker-on judge of the motives which have actuated you during the compilation of your anti-vaccine works? If you can find me any loop-hole through which to escape, be it incapacity, or what you will, I will cheerfully adopt it, rather than think so very ill of any of my species, as I must of the author of the *LUES BOVILLA*, &c. &c. without some such healing supposition.

It is not to my immediate purpose to descant upon the extreme impropriety of adopting as a title-page decoration to your former publication, a name for the vaccine which is totally foreign to its nature, unallowed by your professional brethren, and calculated,

by its ill sound, to prejudice the ignorant, many of whom would certainly never read more of your elaborate works than that portion which adorns your bookseller's windows. Neither is it my intention to wade through those of your publications which are already fast sinking into neglect and silence; I mean with the medical world. I wish, as far as possible, to confine myself solely to your last pamphlet, in which you modestly claim a knowledge of your profession superior to the united wisdom of your countrymen; and expect that your opinions are to be credited in preference to the experience of perhaps the highest medical tribunal that could ever have been constituted.

Those who are merely solicitous after truth, are generally humble in advancing their opinions, decent towards their opposers, and temperate in all their assertions. That your pamphlet displays an opposite state of mind, let its first page (and that no very long one) witness. In this short space we have----
*Interested in the practice of vaccination---furious
 partisans----renovated mania----bloody flag----
 vaccine bull---siege---pop-guns of blockheadism
 —half-starved apothecaries—unreasonable expectations from the college of physicians, &c. &c. &c.*
 Really, Dr. I almost mistook you for Cobbett,

or the author of Bonaparte's manifestos. Let me seriously ask, what would you think of any other author's claims to respect and belief, who made use of so nonsensical a farrago in the outset of his work.

Your first attempt is to throw ridicule upon the vote of the House of Commons : but let me again ask you, do you suppose that there are no persons in that house capable of forming a tolerably accurate opinion upon the detail of facts which was laid before them? Are there no practised and able lawyers among that body, whose lives have been spent in weighing testimonies and appreciating evidence? No close logicians, who could have seen through deductions unsupported by fact? No protectors of the public purse, ardently anxious for the public welfare, and honestly jealous of a wasteful expenditure? For I cannot believe that, in your wildest moments, you could think that body had entered into a conspiracy to reward a man undeserving of their support, or suppose them as open to a bribe as, it is reported, some of their sober constituents are.

You complain (p. 6.) that there was “no medical rationale demanded” by the committee, “nor was any given; no pathology, physiology, or medical science disclosed.”

If you really are serious in this complaint, you must conceive that the House of Commons have leisure, taste, and minds previously cultured for the understanding such disquisitions, and consequently that they ought to appoint a medical lecturer, as well as a chaplain, to their honorable house. You would do well to apply for the appointment, and the house may be assured, on their acceptance of your offer, of much entertainment and much originality. But seriously :---that great body were satisfied, and perhaps any persons but the envious and prejudiced ought likewise to be so, with the evidence adduced to fact, without entering into metaphysical reasonings or conjectural speculations respecting the origin of the disease, or the laws by which it acts. In so doing, they but followed the common wisdom of mankind, who have gratefully received the benefits of nature without troubling their heads about her *modus operandi*. Did our primitive ancestors refuse to employ fire, because they understood not its nature? Do you yourself refuse to cook your beef steak, until it be settled whether coals be of vegetable origin, or determined whether fire be matter or motion?

In your assertion that there had been but three years experience of vaccination, (p. 6.)

when the house passed their vote, you have made a small error, which you must allow me to correct; at the same time referring you to an Inquiry into the Causes and Effects of the Vaccine, written by one Dr. Jenner, which I much suspect you never yet attentively read. You will there find the cases of persons vaccinated twenty, thirty, nay more years ago, who have resisted the variolous inoculation; and surely one so practised in that inoculation as Dr. M. will not refuse to admit this as conclusive, when added to the four years' experience from arm to arm. You have no doubt but that the natural and inoculated small-pox are the same disease, act by the same laws, and, with regard to subsequent susceptibility, are identically the same. It surely therefore is no unwarrantable stretch of supposition to believe, indeed you yourself acknowledge, that the same relations subsist between the vaccine, as propagated immediately from the cow, and as communicated from one human being to another.

Here, too, you must allow me to observe, that your mention of reward in the very outset of your pamphlet, carries with it a bad appearance: like the *ab jove principium*, it contains a display of principle, but of one far less deserving of commendation than that of piety, or grati-

tude to the dispenser of good. Why did you give such a handle to your wicked antagonists for mentioning envy, malice, and uncharitableness; or for the cynic to sneer at the disinterestedness of your labours in the field of variolation? Indeed, when I read your statement of the sentiments of the House of Commons, and of the medical world on this subject; when I see you regret that “party tongues were dumb,” and the “spirits of contention absorbed in sympathetic composure and unity;” I cannot avoid recurring to the madman, who, differing from the rest of mankind, was out-voted, and confined for life to a cell in Bedlam. Dear Sir, do consider the danger of thus dissenting from the received notions of your fellow creatures.

You are angry any one should assert “that the small-pox has been annihilated at Marseilles.” But the evil rests not with one sea-port town; the whole of Bombay is so freed from this pest, that the poor Hindoos will often submit to no inoculation at all.---The small-pox is gone, say they: you have driven it from amongst us; when it comes again we will be vaccinated; it now is useless. Dr. Sacco also writes that your beloved variola is extinct at Milan; and Dr. Freer, professor of physic at Glasgow, has not seen it

in that town for two years. I am sorry that I cannot condole with you on this sad event; but I assure you it is true.

“To understand,” you say, “the true character of the College Report, it is necessary to know who are the members that constituted the committee for collecting the materials.” You then proceed to assert that they are all prejudiced men; all men that had previously committed themselves: but you do not, I fear, consider that it is intolerable arrogance to suppose that so many men of the first medical eminence should be deceived in what *you* so clearly see, and intolerable malignity to impute to so large a body a determination to deceive. What reason is there that I, or any other of your fellow subjects, should give you credit for honor and perspicuity at the expence of so many persons, whose characters, moral and intellectual, were till this moment never suspected? You assert that “they had gone beyond the limits of moderation as evidence before the committee of the House of Commons; or in print, or as members of, or subscribers to, the Jennerian society,” &c. &c. What will a fair reasoner deduce from this? That so many men of good repute had run, head over heels, into a scrape; or that they, having

well weighed the circumstances, gave strong testimony of the efficacy of vaccination by the conduct they adopted.

You proceed to state (p. 10.) that “ they
 “ who blindly commit themselves to the
 “ guidance of enthusiasm, and advance on
 “ baseless hypothesis, are generally left to
 “ the choice of dishonorable obstinacy, or
 “ disgraceful recantation.”

*Cum tua prævideas oculis male lippus inunctis,
 Cur in amicorum vitiis tam cernis acutum?*

Is it not strange that you should imagine “baseless hypothesis,” where others have seen nothing but logically strict induction; and that you should not perceive the possibility of your standing in the very predicament in which you would fain place your opponents? It is indeed wonderful, most wonderful, that you should see nothing but fancy in the experience of an united world, and conceive that Moseley, Birch, and company, are the only infallibles.

Admit that Dr. Jenner is too much interested to behold, with unprejudiced eyes, the result of his own experiments; what are we to think of Dr. Stanger’s, and your neighbour Mr. Mac Grigor’s trials? Are the children of the Foundling and Military Asylum ex-

empt from the ordinary laws of nature? or are those gentlemen altogether unworthy of credit?

You yourself have confessed, that in the beginning you opposed the new practice upon analogy, and from no experience you then had in the disease; in what then did you differ from those who proceed upon hypothesis---baseless hypothesis? You assert, that “the fellows of the college, in general, had no practical experience in vaccination.” (p.10.) Granting this assertion of your’s to be true, they trod but in your own steps, and the reproof comes with a very ill grace from Dr. Moseley. But the fact is, I believe, altogether the reverse. There are few, indeed, of the physicians composing that body, who have neglected to become personally acquainted with every fact relative to this immortal discovery: not one father of a family among them, as far as I know, who has neglected to avail himself of its benefits, when the opportunity of adopting it has occurred: And if this fact be admitted, what greater pledge can you require of their sincerity?

You consider their circular letters as a tacit confession of ignorance; you think it strange that so learned a body should *condescend* to ask evidence of apothecaries, surgeons, and

midwives. You surely would have been much less contented, had they been satisfied with their own *ipsi dixerunt*. You complain that they have sought truth wherever they could find it; a *sure proof that that truth is decisively hostile to your own opinions*.

You suppose “it is in vain to inform the
 “ Reporters that you know of no disease,
 “ one only excepted, that has brought more
 “ mischiefs into the world, than the Cow-
 “ pox.” (p. 11.) Had you advanced one or two facts, contradictory to received opinions and the united voice of your professional brethren, Dr. Moseley’s name at least would have rendered his assertions the object of attentive inquiry; but when you bring forth volumes of pretended facts, totally unsupported by the concurring testimony of the respectable part of the profession engaged in the same investigation; when you (*who never practice vaccination*) pretend to have seen what neither Cline, Abernethy, nor any other surgeon of character; what neither the whole College of Physicians nearly, nor any of the active practisers of vaccination have met with; it is surely allowable in the College to pay attention to the majority, both in point of number and weight, and utterly to neglect evidence

obtained (to use Admiral Berkeley's words) from the very *kennels of science*.

You ask if the Fellows of the College know what the origin of the cow-pox is? In my turn, let me ask you if you know the origin of small-pox? But the tree is known by its fruit.---You would think it very strange, if some of your noble patients were to inquire your birth and parentage, before they trusted you with their pulse; and, I should think, you would be little solicitous about the vintage of your wine, provided it be agreeable to the palate and grateful to the stomach. Indeed, indeed, Doctor, this is one of the most futile of your objections.

You say (p. 12.) that you believe inoculation from the horse's heel has never been practised either on the cow or human subject; thereby clearly proving how little you have read of your opponent's works. Let me inform you, that Mr. Loy, of Whitby, in Yorkshire, published his experiments on this head, and they are decisive: Dr. Sacco has done the same: all your ingenious conjectures therefore must now cease.

You proceed in your 13th page, to an enumeration of “tumours, ulcerations, green
“discharges, rank itches, scald heads, in-
“veterate corrosions, distorted joints, and

“ rotten bones, *peculiar* to the cow-pox, and
 “ consequently of a *new* character.” In the
 name of common sense, truth, and humanity,
 what do you mean by this catalogue of ills?
 Do you intend to assert that cow-pox gene-
 rates the itch insect?---that it generates the
 peculiar poison of *tinea capitis*?---that these,
 and the rest of your farrago, were unknown
 previous to the introduction of vaccination?
 If you have any meaning at all, I should
 conceive it is, that vaccination, like any
 other febrile complaint, may call into action
 the latent predisposition for disease, where it
 may happen to exist; (I allow that the lan-
 guage is inaccurate, but it expresses the idea
 as well as any language can.) But can you as-
 sert that the small-pox (a much more violent
 commotion of the system) does not the same
 in a fifty-fold greater degree? or do you mean
 that variolated patients are for ever exempt
 from such calamities? You cannot *honestly*
 assert any thing of the kind. All analogy,
 and, what is infinitely more, all evidence goes
 to prove the direct contrary:---that vaccina-
 tion, by its peculiar mildness, has never pro-
 duced any of these consequences, which, in
 many families, are ~~the sequel~~ inevitably of *the*
 small-pox. There is a want of candour (I
 wish the world may prove uncharitable in

saying a dereliction of truth) so evident in the whole of this part of your story, that I am at a perfect loss where to seek for your justification. Vaccine itch !—Vaccine diarrhæa !! Good heavens ! are these the assertions of a physician of the 19th century !!! You assert, too, a peculiarity of character and appearance, and I know Mr. Birch did the same: but it is also notorious that Mr. Cline could see nothing in the cases which Mr. Birch exhibited to him, but *plain, common scrophula*. I do not fear singularity in crediting the eyes of that gentleman in preference to those of any of the opposers of vaccination that have yet appeared.

I must now pass over four pages of matter, totally irrelative to the subject before us, and go on to page 17, where you insert the following passage from the Dublin Report :

“ The small-pox is rendered a much less
 “ formidable disease in this country (Ireland)
 “ by the frequency of inoculation for it, than it
 “ is in other parts of his Majesty’s dominions,
 “ where prejudices against inoculation have
 “ prevailed ; hence parents, not unnaturally,
 “ objected to the introduction of a new disease,
 “ rather than not recur to that, with the mild-
 “ ness and safety of which they were well ac-
 “ quainted.” What have we to do with the

prejudices of the lower class of Irish? Does this prove any thing? But why not quote the whole Report?---why take as isolated passages, what were intimately connected with the rest of it?---why not go on to state such testimony as the following, which being part of the same paper, is no less worthy of note? It does not appear to be a very fair mode of proceeding.

“ The correspondence of the Institution
 “ appears to be very general throughout every
 “ part of Ireland, and by the accounts re-
 “ ceived, as well from medical practitioners
 “ as others, the success of vaccination seems
 “ to be uniform and effectual. At the present
 “ period, in the opinion of your Committee,
 “ *there are few individuals in any branch of the*
 “ *profession, who oppose the practice of vaccination*
 “ in this part of his Majesty’s dominions.

“ It is the opinion of your Committee, that
 “ the practice of cow-pox inoculation is safe,
 “ and that it fully answers all the purposes
 “ that have been intended by its introduction.
 “ At the same time, your Committee is wil-
 “ ling to allow that doubtful cases have been
 “ reported to them as having occurred, of per-
 “ sons suffering from small-pox, who had been
 “ previously vaccinated. Upon minute in-
 “ vestigation, however, it has been found that

“ these supposed instances *originated generally*
 “ *in error, misrepresentation, or the difficulty of*
 “ *discriminating between small-pox and other*
 “ *eruptions*, no case having come to the know-
 “ ledge of your Committee, duly authenti-
 “ cated by respectable and competent judges,
 “ of genuine small-pox succeeding the regular
 “ vaccine disease.

“ The practice of vaccination becomes every
 “ day more extended; and, when it is con-
 “ sidered that the period at which it came
 “ into general use in Ireland is to be reckoned
 “ from so late a date, your Committee is of
 “ opinion, that it has made already as rapid a
 “ progress as could be expected.”

(Signed) “ *James Cleghorn.*

“ *Daniel Mills.*

“ *Hugh Ferguson.*”

I suppose that in these paragraphs you could see no “cool, unbiassed, sober sense,” and therefore did not choose to print them; but it would be quite as *fair* to take the sense and nonsense together, if it were only to judge of the authority due to the reporters.

Let us pass your travellers to the moon, as not bearing very strongly on the point, (tho’ by the bye it is not quite handsome to insinuate that eleven-twelfths of the medical world are incorrigible *liars*, and that the

College of Physicians cannot tell the moon from a green cheese): and proceed to your other charges against that body and their Report. The College of Physicians, most unequivocally, did *not* keep “their eyes on what “they were told was Vaccina’s support,” but *did* “look awry,” and endeavour to “dis- “cover her scabs, her sores, her filth, and her “deformity.” You confess in the very pamphlet under consideration that you (who appear to be most conversant with such particulars) *underwent their examination*. If your evidence was not thought deserving of much attention, when given, I do not see how they could help it :---but more of this hereafter.

“Ignorance of the small-pox, you say, “(p. 19.) and of the proper method of inoculation, has made that disease terrible.” Why may not the same cause operate in producing failure of vaccination? Why may not the ignorance of vaccinators occasionally produce excessive inflammation, by inserting improper matter; or why may not such ignorance presume to assert safety, where there has been no perfect vaccination?---propositions that do not often enter into your calculations. Say or do what you will, this ignorance must, in a certain degree, prevail amongst a large portion of practitioners in both diseases; but

woeful indeed must be the ignorance of vaccinators to produce the number of deaths *that daily occur from inoculated small-pox*.

Accidents however will happen in the best regulated families; and even Dr. Moseley has had his misfortunes. The name of Erskine, Sir, cannot be forgotten by you. It is not a pleasant, more than a liberal, thing, to throw your mistakes or failures in your face; but your boasts on this subject have drawn it from me, *not for your mortification*, but in just support of the cause I have advocated.

You next copy the advertisement in the Morning Herald of July 19, 1808, and, in your comment on it, accuse its subscribers of taking up opinions before the practice could possibly be known. But, Sir, is it to be credited that such men as Saunders, Baillie, and the long and splendid list of persons quoted by you, as giving their names to that advertisement, should so degrade themselves as men and practitioners? *To my certain knowledge*, Mr. Abernethy had put the practice to a severe test before he set his name to that paper; nor do I doubt that the other gentlemen had done the same. If so, it is the last degree of vanity in you to treat such people with so much disrespect. “Queen Mab” must have been busy with other brains besides

those of vaccinators, when it could be supposed that they built their faith upon two years' experience, without reference to Dr. Jenner's previous experiments. They repeated his experiment of vaccination, and finding that not fail, most reasonably gave credit to his cases which had stood the test of years; cases, the truth of which were well known to others besides the narrator. They did not idly remain spectators of the ravages of small-pox, till the revolution of fifty years could put them into the possession of similar histories.

Here, again, you must allow me to pass over many pages of your pamphlet. Dr. Pemberton's reputation as a scholar and a physician can need no defence on my part; and, as I have not *purchased* your book, I can have no objection to your filling it with superstitious anecdotes of Harvey, or remarks on the College of Physicians, which we have already seen in that most extraordinary compilation the Medical Observer: though I cannot pass without a most decided disapprobation (as far as my authority can have any weight, *quod scio quam sit exiguum*) the attempt at rendering ridiculous a body of men, whose exertions, from the first establishment of their power, have been ever directed to the public

welfare ; and, under the specious pretext of destroying an offensive monopoly, jacobinically trying to reduce them to the level of the herd of *soi disant* Doctors, who now infest Great Britain. You yourself are allowed by public report to be proud of the title of scholar, and boast of your acquaintance with the learned and oriental languages ; it therefore is not what might be expected of Dr. Moseley, to abuse an institution which is expressly calculated for keeping alive a few sparks of literature among the medical race, who, in these money-getting days, are for the most part more sedulous votaries of Plutus than of Minerva.

In your 35th page, you proceed to inform us, that you received from the College a letter, requesting your opinions relative to the new practice. This you consider, (p.17.) I suppose, to have been a step unworthy of the College. If they knew as much as Dr. M. why apply to him ?---if not, why presume to sit in judgment upon him, rather than confess their ignorance, and give the cause up for trial into his more experienced hands ? But I must repeat, that had the College adopted the opposite mode of proceeding, and given their report on their own sole authority, you would have been the last person to cease reproving

them for such presumptuous and improper conduct. Admitting that the Fellows of the College were as ignorant as the herd whom you have made your associates ; ignorant not only of this new disease, but of *nearly every law of the human œconomy*, to whom were they to apply for information ? To physicians as ignorant as themselves ? or to the practised vaccinators --- to the “ cow-pox clubs and associations,” as you call them ; who, from having dedicated a large portion of their time to the practice, were, according to ordinary human calculation, most likely to know something of the matter : and whatever you, Sir, may think to the contrary, they had given some pledges of feeling for their fellow-creatures, and, what is more to our purpose, of the sincerity of their opinions, in the sums of money they had expended, as well as the time they had devoted in forwarding the Jennerian discovery.

It becomes not those, says the proverb, to throw stones who have themselves glass windows : it cannot therefore but appear that you have been imprudent in raising this clamour against the *sincerity* of your opponents. In the first place, you are fairly out-numbered, and the world will not give you credit, at the expence of so many respectable and worthy

men. Again, you should consider which disease can put the most money into the pockets of the profession? You will certainly allow the small-pox: for no one but yourself and friends have *often* seen any of those dreadful sequelæ of vaccination which could throw a sixpence into an apothecary's till; while small-pox in itself, *exclusive of after consequences*, in opulent families, cannot afford less than five guineas per head to an attendant of but ordinary dexterity in furnishing out a bill. Where then is the suspicion of interest? in him who supports, or him who deserts, a lucrative branch of his profession.

But to return:---In consequence of the letter from the College, you sent them your books on vaccination, accompanied by a denial of its preventive faculty, and an assertion of its dismal consequences. On the fourth of December, you received another letter, requesting your attendance, with which request you complied; and, at your desire, your answers to the College were put down in writing.

Your assertions on this occasion were, as usual, indefinite. Your cases of failure were too numerous to be reckoned. Vaccination, you asserted, had produced new diseases, *which you did not choose to describe*; but bluntly referred to your book. Now, Sir, the Pre-

sident of the College had informed you, that he had read the book ; and the question was evidently put to you, because your descriptions in that book were not altogether intelligible. It was a sort of *Davus non Œdipus sum* question ;---it was a confession of incompetency to penetrate the thick mist of *verbiage* in which you had cloaked your meaning ; and it would have been but civil, but respectful, to have enlarged a little upon these *new* diseases, before a company so well able to appreciate your discoveries ; *if indeed they were capable of being put into a clear light*. But the line of conduct you then observed, has thrown on you the suspicion, either that you did not know such diseases, *unless with your book in hand* ; or that you feared the College would see through your misrepresentations ; or, which is the most charitable, that you were angry that such a court of inquiry should have been instituted at all, or at any rate without your being a member. Indeed it is to be wished you had been a little more explicit.

By question 5, you were asked, if you conceived “ that the opinion of those physicians “ who had paid particular attention to cutaneous diseases, should have any weight in “ determining how far any new cutaneous

“ disorder has appeared since the introduction of cow-pox.” To which you replied, “ certainly,” if he be a man of talents, &c. &c. “ and of unbiassed judgment; *but you know* “ *no such man.*” Now give me leave to bring you acquainted with such a man, the very man to whom it is believed the College referred in their question: Dr. Willan, Sir, is just the man you seek for. It is in vain for you to assert that he is a biassed man, because he differs from you in opinion. He is no more biassed than Harvey was, when he asserted the circulation, or a Christian in asserting his creed.—He is convinced, not biassed. A man may be biassed by money paid, by prospects of emolument, by national or family prejudice; and other similar motives; but he is convinced by evidence and reasoning alone. Now I do not see that Dr. Willan stands in any of the former predicaments: he is above a bribe, either in possession or prospect: he was personally unknown to the inventor of vaccination, when he adopted his opinions; nor do I find any reason for believing that the Doctor did not give his verdict upon this occasion, like a good man and true.

By question 7, you are asked for instances of failure and misfortune:---You refuse to give them. By question 10, you are asked

for instances of death :---You refer to your book ; and mention one more as having happened since its publication, *which you do not relate*. In your answer to question 12, you assert the truth of Ed. Gee's case, the lad who you report had cow's hair growing upon him. Do you remember being asked whether you were really *in earnest or only joking*, when you adduced such evidence? This wonderful hair, after all, proved to belong to the blanket in which the poor wretch was wrapped ; for he had indeed ulcers---ulcers proceeding from an inveterate itch!

Without noticing the injustice of compelling your purchasers to buy the College Report, which perhaps they already have, let us proceed to page 52 of your eloquent review ; where you say that 'you know the Report to be virtually that of the whole College,' but that you trust its sentiments are those only of a few of its individuals. If this had been the case, the dissentients would have revised the Report of their Committee previous to its publication ; or they might afterwards have protested against its contents. You then state that no one could suppose you would suffer such an attack on your principles to remain unanswered. Now, I for one, not knowing you otherwise than as a public character, had

the weakness to suppose that you would receive with some deference the opinions of men like the College, although opposite to your own previous conceptions. I did think you would calmly review your own experience, and, if unable to find the source of your own error, would try to discover that of your opponents. I thought you would credit them for honesty, and try to convince them by other arguments than declamation and abuse: in short, I did not expect to see you in print for these twelvemonths.

At the outset of this letter I stated my regret that you had again come before the public: the spirit you breathe is not that of a man conscious of having truth on his side, but the vague and abusive exclamations of one worsted in argument, and forced to feel that he is in the wrong. I once heard that you expressed some compunctions of mind for the line of conduct you had adopted: judge therefore of my disappointment at beholding your perseverance in it. I blush for you when I read your assertion, that the whole College of Physicians, licentiates and all; the whole College of Surgeons, save two persons, of whom one is yourself, are an “unphilosophical and superficial class of “bigots;” for such you say are the modern

opposers of small-pox, and such are the men whom you describe as its opponents. Really, Doctor, this is “out-Heroding Herod—“ pray you avoid it.”

You ask (p. 54.) “if facts can be produced
 “by men, who believe that one disease will
 “prevent another between which there is
 “neither connection nor analogy.” What, Sir, is there no analogy between small-pox and the vaccine?—Are they not both affections of the skin, producing constitutional affection?—Are they not both respecters of periods in their progress?—Both communicable by actual contact; and, in fact, differing little but in mildness and facility of communication? Are these no analogies? But analogies are not the grounds on which to proceed. Facts are produced that must supersede all reasoning. All the negative cases you have adduced, admitting them to be all correct, when weighed against the *positive evidence of the four quarters of the world*, must go for little more than nothing. You admit a confined and temporary preventive faculty*, directly in

* This supposition of a temporary change produced by the vaccine fluid on the system, arose from a circumstance not unknown to the doctor. During the existence of many chronic eruptions, the skin is in a greater or less degree insensible to the influence of the vaccine fluid; and so too

contradiction to *your favourite analogy*; in contradiction to the known laws of morbid poisons; and of fact. You confound with constitutional disease, the local variolous affection, for which the skin in general retains its susceptibility through life, in defiance of previous small-pox itself. You nick-name old and well-known diseases; and, because they occur at any period after vaccination, consider them as its consequences: yet you are angry with your opponents for detecting such fallacies, and *stigmatise their moral character* for recommending a practice, “of the effects of which,” you say, “they are totally ignorant.”

You complain that your opinions have been *crammed into a report* by men of equal rank in society with yourself. This, Sir, is not the case. You have most unequivocally degraded yourself, by the *ad captandum* manner in which you have conducted this contest:---Your

it is of the variolous poison. Hence imperfect vaccinations have occurred; and, upon testing with variolous inoculation, imperfect small-pox; that is to say, an eruption of a few evanescent pustules, or perhaps none at all, exactly as is the case after perfect vaccination. The protection, however, arises from the chronic disease, and not from the vaccination. When, therefore, that disease is cured, the constitution remains as susceptible of vaccine or variolous action as if no operation had been performed.

LUES BOVILLA, your unconnected rhapsodies, your wretched abuse of the benevolent Rowland Hill, and of your other opponents, and, above all, your quibbling arguments, have, I fear, irredeemably “amalgamated you” with the “hireling scribbler and illiterate pamphleteer.”

In page 55, you “flatly deny, as far as respects yourself, that the opposers of vaccination have been *falsely* led by hypothetical reasoning ;” and in the very next page you confess that “on the ground alone of the mildness of the disease, were there no other, and were this the first time you ever heard of the cow-pox, you would oppose it ; being certain *that such a NO disease could not so change the disposition of the system as to render it unsusceptible of any disease whatsoever.*” What is this but being led by hypothesis ?--- whether *falsely* or no, scarcely remains to be proved.

Liars, they say, should have good memories, and so too should hypothetical writers. If cow-pox be so mild a disease as to convince you of its *incapacity of so changing the disposition of the system as to render it unsusceptible of any disease whatever*, how comes it that you can so readily credit its power of creating new and calling to existence old diseases ? What

now becomes of your ox faces, hairs, itches, blotches, and the plurima mortis imago, that you have laid to its door? Is the vaccine inert as to good, and active only in the spreading of evil? You are here betrayed into an absurdity greater than your worst enemies could have wished: you have exhibited the last degree of want of candour, or of understanding: but I begin to tire, in following you through all the mazes of juggle and contradiction.---Let us hasten to the close.

In page 57, you roundly assert that small-pox inoculation is an *innocent* and *absolutely perfect* security against the small-pox. In page 59, you write that “*deaths may happen; because there are other duties besides those of the inoculator to be performed. Patients and nurses may err; and there are besides idiosyncrasies which no general law can control.*”

You *know*, then, that inoculated small-pox is no *innocent* security; and Mr. Birch, too, when he asserted to the Committee of the House of Commons that he had never met with misfortune in his inoculations, might have recollected one of his own patients whom Mr. Cline was at that time attending with him for a critical abscess, *the immediate consequence of inoculated small-pox*, by which life was put into the most imminent hazard. Loss of life

from vaccination has been estimated at one in 50,000, and this estimate is much within the truth. Your own experience cannot bear you out, I fear, in any such praise of small-pox inoculation. You offer to lecture on small-pox gratis: but can you thereby render others more successful than yourself? --- and you have had your misfortunes --- therefore for Heaven's sake, no more *cant* about the *innocency* of small-pox.

“ But there is not,” you say, (p. 59.) “ a
 “ single death recorded among the vast num-
 “ bers inoculated by Dimsdale, the Suttons,
 “ Archer, and Woodville. Upwards of a
 “ million of people were inoculated by these
 “ gentlemen and their assistants.” This, if
 not positively false in toto, is at least a gra-
 tuitous assertion. Baron Dimsdale, I should
 think, would hardly have borne you out in it.
 He was no quack, and his practice stood upon
 too high ground to need any such unwarrant-
 able, because impossible, puffs. “ Deaths”
 you know “ will happen: --- Patients and
 “ nurses will err --- there are idiosyncrasies
 “ which no law can control.” With all which
 patients, nurses, and idiosyncrasies, your quin-
 quevirate had to contend. But — “ to strike
 you with astonishment at once,” I must refer
 you to the records of the Small-pox Hospital

while under Dr. Woodville's direction, and there you will no doubt find many instances of death, blindness, and misery, of which you, "good easy man," never so much as dreamed, unless perhaps in those minutes, when the loss of one of your own small-pox patients might excite such an incubus :--- therefore, once again, no more cant about the innocence of small-pox.

After such gross perversion of fact, whether wilful or not, can you, dare you, object to such passages in the Report as the following ?

" It has been already mentioned, that the
 " evidence is not universally favourable, al-
 " though it is in truth nearly so, for there are
 " a few who entertain sentiments differing
 " widely from those of the great majority of
 " their brethren. The College, therefore,
 " deem it their duty, in a particular manner,
 " to enquire upon what grounds and evidence
 " the opposers of vaccination rested their opi-
 " nions. From personal examination, as well
 " as from their writings, they endeavoured to
 " learn the full extent and weight of their ob-
 " jections. They found them without expe-
 " rience in vaccination, supporting their opi-
 " nions by hearsay information, and hypo-
 " thetical reasoning, and, upon investigating
 " the facts which they advanced, they found

“ them to be either misapprehended or misrepresented; or that they fell under the description of cases of imperfect small-pox, before noticed, and which the College have endeavoured fairly to appreciate.”

Are you not yourself convicted of “ hypothetical reasoning;” adopting “ hearsay evidence; (your LUES BOVILLA is, for the most part, nothing else); of misapprehension and misrepresentation.” Oh! Doctor, Doctor, “ *sapere aude!*”---at least have the wisdom to be silent, when, thus to babble, only trumpets your mistakes.

As to the *efficacy* of small-pox in preventing a new attack of the same disease, a profusion of cases have been brought to prove, that occasionally the full constitutional effects have appeared after a previous attack, by which the patient’s countenance has suffered sufficiently to bear abundant testimony of the truth of my assertion; and of this, death has more than once been the consequence. But, if the appearance of a few local eruptions upon the contact of variolous matter be enough to constitute small-pox, as you have said in an hundred instances, it can be readily proved that even the casual disease is no better security than vaccination.

It is remarked by the reporters, that when small-pox has succeeded vaccination, it has

neither been the same in violence or duration. To this you reply, that you would “pay respect to such assertions, were they founded “in the *experience of those* that made them.” Now I have seen such cases, where the eruption, after appearing to proceed regularly for some days, suddenly died away and scaled off, long before the period of termination in the ordinary small-pox. But I cannot follow you through all your puffs and abuse, lest anger get the better of judgment, and I become as scurrilous as yourself.

In page 63, you say “that small-pox, “whether natural or inoculated, gives rise “to no disease peculiar to the specific nature of variolous infection:” and again, “but how is it with cow-pox?” What then, ulcers, itch, blotches, tumours, hairy skins, diarrhœas, and a whole nosology of other diseases are *peculiar to the specific nature of the vaccine poison?* If so, why do they not occur in every case of vaccination? If they are peculiar to the poison, they must be the *constant attendants* upon it. This is more arrant nonsense than ever yet disgraced the pages of empiricism: and if it be nonsense, you admit that there is “*no quantity of disease*” in cow-pox sufficient to rouse latent predispositions into action. If, therefore, these diseases lurk

neither in the poison, nor are called forth by its action on the constitution, we must conclude that your stories are fictions, or that they have depended upon causes wholly extrinsic to vaccination. That your first proposition is unfounded in fact, and totally contrary to all known laws of morbid poisons, I appeal to the whole medical world; and if I be right in this particular, my deductions are built on the strictest logical reasoning, and I believe are perfectly undeniable.

You complain that the College deny the existence of new, unheard-of, and monstrous diseases, the sequelæ of cow-pox, “after you “ had sent them your publications, and *personally* confirmed the facts you had therein “ written.” Do turn back to the answers you gave to the enquiries of the Committee: have you there entered into the detail of any one case?---have you discussed any one physiological principle? No, Sir; all that is to be collected from that document, as you yourself give it, is—my book—my book; look to my book. If, after that, they paid no attention to your book, and its *visa et audita* which no *credible* man besides yourself ever heard or saw, upon my word I cannot blame them.

Now, Sir, as to your *new* diseases : If the cow-pox be capable of producing your ox-face, I see no reason why it should not also produce horns, hoofs, and tails, or whatever else your fertile imagination can suggest. This is far, far too ridiculous for serious confutation ! Strabismus, tumefaction, and abscess, have nothing in them new, monstrous, and unheard-of, except in your assertion that the inoculation of the vaccine fluid is capable of producing them. I must repeat the question put to you in the College :---are you serious or joking ? But, Sir, “ *people* have “ not given this sort of face the appellation “ of ox-face ;” Dr. Rowley informs us that the full credit attached to the invention of this term resides wholly and totally with yourself.

As for your itchings and tearing of flesh, your tetters, nettle rashes, &c. I can only refer you to Celsus and other writers, previous to the discovery of vaccination, particularly to Turner’s book on the Skin, from which, though it was written nearly 100 years ago, your coadjutor Squirrel *borrowed* nearly verbatim the whole of his descriptions of cow-pock eruptions !!!

Your description of “ an head covered with “ scabs,” &c. “ *nothing like common scald head,*”

is but an aggravated case of tinea, such as a few weeks back you might have seen in St. Bartholomew's Hospital, cured by the remedies usually applied to common scald head; and which could not very conveniently be attributed to vaccination in a subject that had not submitted to that process.

In page 67, you say, "*But if* the cow-pox " be no security against the small-pox," &c. To give you a better chance of putting your doubts to rest, I must beg your attention to the following extract from Dr. MacKenzie's report of the state of vaccination at Madras, dated 1st Sept. 1807. --- " Notwithstanding " the variolated state of the atmosphere, the " unusual ingress of poor from neighbouring " countries, and the circumstances that have " concurred to protract the duration of small- " pox; I have not been able, on the most " minute enquiry and investigation, to attach " a single case of small-pox infection to an " individual duly vaccinated." The numbers vaccinated during one twelvemonth, from the 1st Sept. 1806, in the above presidency, were 243,175.* Dr. Keir also writes from Bombay,

* From the beginning of September 1802, to the end of May 1805, 429,821 persons were successfully vaccinated

that “ in many thousand instances the disease
 “ has been put to the test of variolous inocu-
 “ lation, and exposure to the contagion of the
 “ natural disease.” “ In no one instance
 “ under his care, (and he has vaccinated nearly
 “ 20,000), has there been one unfavourable
 “ symptom, if we except, in three or four cases,
 “ suppuration of the glands in the arm-pits,
 “ and these did well.” * You surely will not
 affect to think that these gentlemen, so de-
 tached from European politics and European
 cabals, can be affected by motives of in-
 terest, friendship, or passion; or unduely
 influenced in making the statements I have
 transcribed.---Away then, once for all, with
 your ifs.

We have now pretty nearly gone through
 all the argument, and pretence to argument,

at the Presidency of Madras, and its dependencies; vast
 numbers of whom have since been exposed to the Small-
 pox, both by inoculation and contagion, yet have invariably
 resisted the infection; so that the numbers already thus
 secured from the ravages of the Small-pox, at this Presi-
 dency only, amount to 607,895, independently of those
 vaccinated by the Brahmins, and other natives.

* See Mr. Murray's Reply to Highmore's Observations
 on Mr. Fuller's bill.

which your book contains. I have already noticed the modesty of giving the lie direct, p.68. (“hard usage Master Jove”) to the whole of your professional brethren, of whatever rank and dignity, merely because they cannot see with Dr. Moseley’s eyes. I have already noticed Dr. Jenner’s reward as your alpha, and must now note it as nearly the omega of your work.

“In the infancy,” you write, (p. 68.) “of
 “vaccination, before you, or any other per-
 “son, had an opportunity of determining
 “how far vaccinated people who had with-
 “stood the effects of variolous air in rooms
 “and chambers, and even of inoculation;
 “would be secured from the small-pox,
 “when it raged epidemically, you suggested,
 “as may be seen in your Commentaries, that
 “it would not.” Then were you not guilty
 (be you right or wrong in the event) of being
 led by pure hypothesis? From your conduct
 in this instance, it has been concluded, by very
 many men, not of the lowest rank in their pro-
 fession, that, as you idly and without the war-
 rant of experiment, took up an opinion, so you
 have endeavoured to maintain it, and will
 continue through the rest of your life to do so,
 in spite of “men, Gods, and columns.”---

However, though this be a just and fair mode of reasoning, I should rather hope the case is otherwise; and that, being of a warm temperament, your passions alone (I mean amiable passions) have prevented you from throwing off the mist of prejudice with which you had surrounded yourself.

With your defence of Mr. Birch, I have nothing to do:—it is handsome in you to back your friends, though I think you have enough to do to take care of yourself. As to your cases of small-pox after vaccination from the cow, I have only to remark that they, *as usual*, are unsupported by any proof that the patients had been inoculated by cow-pox matter, rather than matter from any other pustule, to which that animal is subject.--- Mistakes of this sort Dr. Jenner has told us were sufficiently common among the farmers in his district, and gave rise to much error and confusion. I wish to be understood as by no means asserting that failure *never* takes place. Error is the lot of humanity, and nature appears to delight in occasional sportiveness. But I do expect, and every honest man will do the same, when exceptions to general rules, or facts contrary to the received opinions of mankind are produced, that such

exceptions and facts should not be stated without most unequivocal proof of their truth; without a full statement of every circumstance that can give the reader an opportunity of judging for himself, and not pinning his faith on Dr. Moseley, or, in medical cases, even on the Bishop of Dromore.

I must also, before we part, recommend you not to be too severe upon “mountebank Jennerian placards,” until your associates cease to paste variolous placards upon errand-carts, and send people round the country to distribute their works. I do not object to you, or to poor Rowley, that you variolated free of éxpense: if you were sincere in your opinions, you did but what you conceived to be your duty, and the Jennerian Society do no more. I know that those advocates for vaccination with whom I have the pleasure to associate, act from the purest motives, and have hearts open as day to melting charity: if some of them have been betrayed into too warm a replication to your writings, or have adopted acts somewhat below the dignity of the profession, remember that cunning can but be counteracted by cunning, and that Dr. Moseley threw the first stone.

I have now, Sir, finished a somewhat long and painful examination of the principal contents of your pamphlet; for it is useless to examine every repetition of the same absurdity, or to follow, paragraph by paragraph, a work, the whole of which turns but upon a few leading errors: those errors exposed, the whole structure must fall to the ground; and to that point I have endeavoured to confine myself. To this examination I have been compelled by your unqualified abuse of all that is great or excellent in the profession of physic; by your utter contempt for public opinion, and ignorance or disregard of the known laws of eruptive diseases; by your puny verbal criticism, with which you attempt to confuse whatever is plain and intelligible to ordinary men. I have seen little indeed of novelty in your pamphlet; as far as regards the question in debate, it is *crambe repetita*, but then you know *δὲς κραμβὴ θάνατος*, and we ought not to stand coolly to be poisoned, even though it be by a physician.

In no respect do your arguments (if indeed they can be called arguments) differ from those that you have already published, and which have been sufficiently answered.

We have, too, the same indiscriminate collection of cases, founded upon your own or some other person's bare assertion, without the mention of any circumstances that can throw light on the subject they profess to illustrate; or that can enable the reader to satisfy himself of the causes producing them, or even of their very truth. We have the same neglect of the laws of eruptive disease, which the progress of this discovery has manifested; the same contempt of every fact which has been adduced against your opinions by the vaccinists, or by authors who, writing before vaccination was known, must even by yourself be esteemed unprejudiced. If we are to judge of you by your writings, can it be supposed that you know any thing of the disease against which you write, or that even your acquaintance with the small-pox is greater than that of every village inoculator? The same over-weening vanity that seems to have actuated you in the first instance to decry the invention of another man, before you could possibly estimate its merits, is conspicuous in every part of your present production.

Brisez le miroir infidelle
Qui vous cache la verité.

Had you adopted an opposite conduct ; had you sitten down with calmness and gone over again the ground which you have already trod, repeated your adversaries' experiments, and re-examined your own cases ; had you fairly admitted, what EVEN YOU cannot deny, that vaccination is capable, in the great majority at least of cases, of destroying the susceptibility for small-pox ; and if afterwards, though you could not see with the eyes of the rest of the world, you had admitted the possibility* of your being mistaken ; you would have gained the proudest of human triumphs---a victory over yourself ; and would have merited the esteem, rather than the ill-word, of all mankind.

I flatter myself that you will give me credit, when I assert that, in criticising your Review, I have endeavoured to irritate your feelings as little as possible ; but *ες τα εσχατα νυσηματα αι εσχαται θεραπειαι* ΕΣ ΑΧΡΙΒΕΙΗΝ ΚΡΑΤΙΣΤΑΙ, and there are passages in your book which claim nothing but the most decided censure. If, in any case, I have been guilty of error, I ask pardon of you, and of all who may be deceived by me.

And now, Sir, give me leave to conclude with an apology for the egotism necessary

to the epistolary form of writing; with an ardent wish that all doubts may cease upon this truly interesting and important subject; and a piece of parting advice to yourself, that may be useful, should you again undertake to brandish the grey goose-quill:

Γνωθι σεαυτον.

I am, Sir,

&c. &c. &c.

Nov. 21st, 1808.

M. T. C.

ERRATUM.

Page 19, line 3 from the bottom, *for* the sequel inevitably, *read* inevitably the sequelæ.

Lately published.

1. **AN ANSWER TO DR. MOSELEY;** containing a Defence of Vaccination. By JOHN RING, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons in London, and of the Medical Societies of London and Paris. 8vo. price 6s.

2. **A ROWLAND FOR AN OLIVER;** in Answer to Dr. Moseley's Oliver for a Rowland, and to Mr. Birch; containing a Defence of Vaccination. By the same. 8vo. price 4s.

3. **AN ANSWER TO MR. BIRCH;** containing a Defence of Vaccination. By the same. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

4. **AN ANSWER TO MR. GOLDSON;** proving that Vaccination is a permanent Security against the Small-Pox. By the same. 8vo. price 1s. 6d.

5. **THE VACCINE SCOURGE; No. I.** 8vo. price 1s.

6. **THE VACCINE PHANTASMAGORIA.** 4to. price 2s.

7. **A REPLY to the ANTI-VACCINISTS.** By JAMES MOORE, Member of the Royal College of Surgeons in London. 8vo. price 2s.

8. **THE VACCINE CONTEST.** By WILLIAM BLAIR, M.A. Surgeon to the Lock Hospital and Asylum, &c. &c. 8vo. price 2s. 6d.

